

KUJIRAI et al., 10/765,913
28 December 2007 Amendment
Reply to 28 September 2007 Office Action

501.43439X00/310300084US1
Page 9

REMARKS

This paper is responsive to any paper(s) indicated above, and is responsive in any other manner indicated below.

OBJECTION TO ABSTRACT - TRAVERSED

The Office Action objection to the Abstract regarding proper content, is respectfully traversed. The Office Action recited text contains many occurrences of "the abstract should ...", but the term "should" (as opposed to "must") expresses a non-mandatory requirement. Applicant desires to maintain a minimalist abstract, in view of the fact that some legal cases have used the content of the abstract for interpreting the scope of the claims. In conclusion, Applicant respectfully submits that the present Abstract complies with all mandatory requirements, and accordingly, Applicant respectfully declines to amend the Abstract. In the event that the Examiner uses discretion to amend the Abstract via Examiner's Amendment, Applicant respectfully submits the following. More particularly, with respect to any past, present or any ultimately-implemented Abstract or amendment thereof, Applicant would like to reiterate and embrace the 37 CFR 1.72(b) provision that "The abstract will not be used for interpreting the scope of the claims."

KUJIRAI et al., 10/765,913
28 December 2007 Amendment
Reply to 28 September 2007 Office Action

501.43439X00/310300084US1
Page 10

REPLACEMENT TITLE

The title has been objected to because of the Office Action concerns listed within the section numbered "2" on page 2 of the Office Action, i.e., as not being sufficiently descriptive. As the foregoing replacement title is believed to be sufficiently descriptive of the invention to which the claims are directed, reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection to the title, are respectfully requested. In the event that the present replacement title is itself found not to be sufficiently descriptive, the Examiner is herein authorized to amend to a suitable replacement title. Further, it is noted that MPEP 1302.02 specifically authorizes an examiner to change the title on or after allowance.

PENDING CLAIMS

Claims 1-20 were pending, under consideration and subjected to examination in the Office Action. Appropriate claims have been amended, canceled and/or added (without prejudice or disclaimer) in order to adjust a clarity and/or focus of Applicant's claimed invention. That is, such changes are unrelated to any prior art or scope adjustment and are simply refocused claims in which Applicant is presently interested. At entry of this paper, Claims 1-20 will be pending for further consideration and examination in the application.

KUJIRAI et al., 10/765,913
28 December 2007 Amendment
Reply to 28 September 2007 Office Action

501.43439X00/310300084US1
Page 11

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 USC '102

All 35 USC '102 rejections are respectfully traversed. However, such rejections have been rendered obsolete by the present clarifying amendments to Applicant's claims, and accordingly, traversal arguments are not appropriate at this time. However, Applicant respectfully submits the following to preclude renewal of any such rejections against Applicant's clarified claims. That is, insofar as any such rejection applies to Applicant's presently-clarified claims, Applicant respectfully submits the following.

All descriptions of Applicant's disclosed and claimed invention, and all descriptions and rebuttal arguments regarding the applied prior art, as previously submitted by Applicant in any form, are repeated and incorporated hereat by reference. Further, all Office Action statements regarding the prior art rejections are respectfully traversed. As additional arguments, Applicant respectfully submits the following.

In order to properly support a '102 anticipatory-type rejection, any applied art reference must disclose each and every limitation of any rejected claim. The applied art does not adequately support a '102 anticipatory-type rejection because, at minimum, such applied art does not disclose (or suggest) the following discussed limitations of Applicant's claims.

KUJIRAI et al., 10/765,913
 28 December 2007 Amendment
 Reply to 28 September 2007 Office Action

501.43439X00/310300084US1
 Page 12

More particularly, Applicant's disclosed and claimed invention is directed toward arrangements which attempt to minimize an amount of processing required for voice recognition of commands, and to avoid erroneous activation of conflicting software applications. That is, a large active speech recognition vocabulary requires a large amount of processing time, whereas a smaller active speech recognition vocabulary requires a smaller amount of processing time. Accordingly, Applicant's invention attempts to minimize a size of a speech recognition vocabulary which is active at any given time.

Further, often differing software applications will each include the same voice commands. For example, Applicant's FIG. 4 (reproduced herewith)

illustrates an example table showing a

"HELP" command being used within two differing applications "1" and "3", and showing a "SEARCH SURROUNDING INFORMATION" command being used within two differing applications "2" and

FIG. 4

ID	COMMAND	CORRESPONDING APPLICATION ID	STATE	VALID/INVALID
1	HELP	1	INTERACTING	VALID
2	HELP	3	INTERACTING	INVALID
3	TOP MENU	0	INSTALLED : ACTIVATED : INTERACTING	VALID
4	SEARCH SURROUNDING INFORMATION	2,5	ACTIVATED	VALID

"5". Unless special precautions are taken (such as with Applicant's claimed invention), the speech recognition of such commands (e.g., "HELP") might invoke actions from two different software applications (e.g., "1" and "3").

KUJIRAI et al., 10/765,913
28 December 2007 Amendment
Reply to 28 September 2007 Office Action

501.43439X00/310300084US1
Page 13

Applicant's disclosed and claimed invention has special precautions to limit a size of a speech recognition vocabulary which is active at any given time, and to avoid a situation of conflicting commands. More particularly, Applicant's independent claim 1, for example, recites (in relevant part) an arrangement, **"wherein the control unit dynamically manages ones of the commands as recognizable or unrecognizable commands via the speech recognition engine according to current operation states of each of the applications"**.

Other ones of Applicant's independent claims have similar or analogous features/limitations. As one example using FIG. 4 above, whenever application "1" was active, Applicant's invention may make application 1's "HELP" command recognizable, while concurrently making application 3's "HELP" command unrecognizable. Whenever application "3" was active, the opposite would be true. Further, by rendering the commands of any inactive application as "unrecognizable" (or "inactive"), Applicant's invention minimizes a number of vocabulary words which are recognizable, thereby speeding up a processing (i.e., speech recognition) time.

KUJIRAI et al., 10/765,913
28 December 2007 Amendment
Reply to 28 September 2007 Office Action

501.43439X00/310300084US1
Page 14

Turning now to rebuttal of the previously-applied art, it is respectfully submitted that none of the Schmid et al. and Hirayama et al. references disclose or suggest any arrangement **"wherein the control unit dynamically manages ones of the commands as recognizable or unrecognizable commands via the speech recognition engine according to current operation states of each of the applications"**. At best, Hirayama et al.'s column 17, lines 15-33, states, "...there is a group of instruction phrases valid only in a given menu screen and there is another group of instruction phrases valid in another menu screen, the other group of instruction phrases valid in the other menu screen but not valid in the given menu screen are directly assigned as invalid words." However, it is respectfully noted that Hirayama et al.'s arrangement is responsive to "menu screens" (not software applications), and further, such menu screens appear to be within a same software application.

In view of the fact that both references are mutually deficient in the above regards, it is respectfully submitted that the previously-applied references would not have supported a 102 anticipatory-type (or a 103 obviousness-type) rejection of Applicant's claims.

In addition to the foregoing, the following additional remarks from Applicant's foreign representative are also submitted in support of traversal of the rejection and patentability of Applicant's claims.

KUJIRAI et al., 10/765,913
28 December 2007 Amendment
Reply to 28 September 2007 Office Action

501.43439X00/310300084US1
Page 15

Schmid et al. discloses a SAPI server which marshals the delivery of recognized speech to the appropriate recognition process for multiple applications. (FIGS. 16-17, and col. 15, line 34 – col. 16, line 56.) However, there is no disclosure of managing ones of the commands as recognizable or unrecognizable according to current operation states of each application.

Hirayama et al. discloses a speech recognition apparatus that judges whether or not a given spoken word contains a specific word in a stored dictionary, generates a recognition word of the given word, and performs a speech recognition process. (FIGS. 3 and 4; etc.) However, there is no disclosure of managing ones of the commands as recognizable or unrecognizable according to current operation states of each of the applications.

As a result of all of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the applied art would not support a '102 anticipatory-type rejection of Applicant's claims. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of such '102 rejection, and express written allowance of all of the '102 rejected claims, are respectfully requested.

EXAMINER INVITED TO TELEPHONE

The Examiner is herein invited to telephone the undersigned attorneys at the local Washington, D.C. area telephone number of 703/312-6600 for discussing any Examiner's Amendments or other suggested actions for accelerating prosecution and moving the present application to allowance.

KUJIRAI et al., 10/765,913
28 December 2007 Amendment
Reply to 28 September 2007 Office Action

501.43439X00/310300084US1
Page 16

RESERVATION OF RIGHTS

It is respectfully submitted that any and all claim amendments and/or cancellations submitted within this paper and throughout prosecution of the present application are without prejudice or disclaimer. That is, any above statements, or any present amendment or cancellation of claims (all made without prejudice or disclaimer), should not be taken as an indication or admission that any objection/rejection was valid, or as a disclaimer of any scope or subject matter. Applicant respectfully reserves all rights to file subsequent related application(s) (including reissue applications) directed to any/all previously claimed limitations/features which have been subsequently amended or cancelled, or to any/all limitations/features not yet claimed, i.e., Applicant continues (indefinitely) to maintain no intention or desire to dedicate or surrender any limitations/features of subject matter of the present application to the public.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that the claims listed above as presently being under consideration in the application are now in condition for allowance.

To the extent necessary, Applicant petitions for an extension of time under 37 CFR '1.136. Authorization is herein given to charge any shortage in the fees, including extension of time fees and excess claim fees, to Deposit Account No.

KUJIRAI et al., 10/765,913
28 December 2007 Amendment
Reply to 28 September 2007 Office Action

501.43439X00/310300084US1
Page 17

01-2135 (referencing case No. 501.43439X00) and please credit any excess fees
to such deposit account.

Based upon all of the foregoing, allowance of all presently-pending claims
is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



/Paul J. Skwierawski/
Paul J. Skwierawski
Registration No. 32,173
ANTONELLI, TERRY, STOUT & KRAUS, LLP

PJS/
(703) 312-6600